

SENATOR WITHEM: Now what is, other than, other than the...you gave kind of a political argument as to why, well, maybe we shouldn't have given this guy these extensions and he is not living up to the original, but we did give the commitment, what is the problem with Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment that sets the money aside and says if he meets the June 30th commitment and is up and running and meets all the standards that he will get this money that was agreed to him, why is that a bad way of doing business, I don't understand that?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Because with...well, the basic analysis done on this three or four years ago, which I have, the engineering report, my contention is that we are taking an undue risk if those standards...

SENATOR WITHEM: But at this point, we have a body of Nebraska policymakers, the ethanol board, that has voted to take that risk and they made a commitment to him, is that not correct?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes.

SENATOR WITHEM: Then why is what Senator Bernard-Stevens is wanting to do a bad idea to meet a commitment that an appointive board of the Nebraska state government has made to an investor?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I am simply saying that there has already been a large time extension made.

SENATOR WITHEM: So your belief is that the Nebraska Legislature should review commitments made by appointive and elective boards in state government, and if we think they made bad decisions, we should pass legislation that revokes those? Is that a good way of doing policy?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I think that they are standing a risk and we, ultimately, are standing that...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: ...risk too, and that's a consideration we should be giving.

SENATOR WITHEM: Okay, I am just one individual trying to make up my mind on this. I support LB 364, probably support 346, too, whatever that bill is, and want to...maybe then again I